



NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC

SERVING LEGAL PROFESSIONALS COAST TO COAST AND INTERNATIONALLY

In The Matter Of

La Union Del Pueblo Entero, et al.,

Plaintiffs

v

State Of Texas, et al.,

Defendants

CASE

5:21-cv-844

Date

4-27-2022

Witness

Jonathan Sherman White

National Court Reporters Inc. • 888.800.9656 •

NationalCourtReporters.com

NCRNetwork@nationalcourtreporters.com

Serving Legal Professionals From Coast To Coast and Internationally

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

LA UNION DEL PUEBLO §
ENTERO, ET AL., §
Plaintiffs, § Civil Action No.
 § 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
VS. § (Consolidated Cases)
 §
STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL. §
Defendants. §

ORAL DEPOSITION OF
JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE
APRIL 27, 2022

ORAL DEPOSITION OF JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE,
produced as a witness at the instance of the Plaintiffs
and Plaintiff-Intervenors, and duly sworn, was taken in
the above-styled and numbered cause on the 27th day of
April 2022, from 9:11 a.m. to 5:31 p.m., before Caroline
Chapman, CSR in and for the State of Texas, reported by
Computerized Stenotype Machine, Computer-Assisted
Transcription, held at the William P. Clements Jr. State
Office Building, 300 West 15th Street, Hearing Room
1001E, Austin, Texas, pursuant to the Federal Rules of
Civil Procedure.

1 **A. I suppose that would be me.**

Q. And what would be necessary for you to -- to make that approval?

MR. HUDSON: Well, I'm going to object, to the extent that that would call for investigative privilege, attorney work-product or attorney-client communications. To the extent that you can answer generally without encroaching on any of those privileges, you're free to do so, but otherwise I'm going to instruct you not to answer.

A. I think primarily there would have to be a determination that a criminal statute -- a criminal statute was violated and that there is sufficient evidence to proceed.

15 Q. And when you say there would be sufficient
16 evidence to proceed, is there a legal standard that
17 would be relevant in you determining whether to proceed
18 with a case?

19 **A. Probable cause, in Texas.**

20 Q. And how long have you been the Division Chief
21 of the Election Integrity Division?

22 **A. I don't recall when exactly it was popped out**
23 **as a standalone division, but it was prior to that. I**
24 **would say that's been in the last year or so, or less**
25 **than that. Prior to that, it was a section of the**

1 **A. I was involved to some degree with, primarily,**
2 **I believe some of the predecessor bills.**

3 Q. In what way were you involved with the drafting
4 of the predecessor bills of Senate Bill 1?

5 **A. In -- in being requested to provide guidance**
6 **regarding portions of those bills.**

7 Q. Which portions of the predecessor bills were
8 you asked to provide guidance on?

9 MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that it
calls for attorney-client privilege, attorney
work-product, or legislative privileged information. To
the extent that you can respond without encroaching on
any of those privileges, you're free to do so,
otherwise, I'm going to instruct you not to answer.

10 **A. I don't know that I can answer that.**

16 Q. Have you been asked -- or were you -- excuse
17 me, were you asked to testify during any hearings on
18 Senate Bill 1 or any of its predecessor bills?

19 **A. I was called as a resource witness on some of**
20 **those hearings on the predecessor bills, and on SB 1, I**
21 **believe, actually, as well.**

22 Q. How many times were you asked to provide
23 testimony on Senate Bill 1 or its predecessor bills?

24 **A. As an estimate, I would say I was probably**
25 **asked to provide testimony or appear as a resource**

1 **witness maybe 10 times. And I probably actually**
2 **testified maybe half of that.**

Q. When you testified for -- excuse me --
withdrawn.

When you were called to testify, what were
you asked to testify about?

MR. HUDSON: I'm going to object to the
extent that that would encroach on attorney-client or
attorney work-product or legislative privilege. To the
extent that you can answer, you can do so. Otherwise,
I'll instruct you not to answer.

And just for clarification of the record,
is your question directed at what he was asked to
testify about in public, or are you asking if there was
a specific ask made by legislators? Because that would
help me instruct him so that he can actually answer your
question.

MS. PAIKOWSKY: Of course.

Q. (By Ms. Paikowsky) I think for the moment we
can limit it to what you were asked to testify in a
public forum.

**A. Wow. I -- I don't think I could even begin to
cover all the questions that I was asked publicly. But
generally it pertained to criminal provisions within the
bills.**

1 Q. Do you -- withdrawn. Which criminal provisions
2 within SB 1 or its predecessor bills were you asked to
3 provide testimony on?

MR. HUDSON: Same objections. To the
extent that it's in the public record, you can answer;
otherwise, I'm going to instruct you not to answer if
it's going to encroach on attorney-client, attorney
8 work-product or legislative privilege.

9 **A. In the -- in the public committee hearings, I**
10 **don't recall specifically which criminal provisions**
11 **within the bills I was asked questions about, and a lot**
12 **of it really ran together.**

13 Q. Do you recall if you were asked to testify on
14 provisions to the voter assistant's oath in Senate
15 Bill 1?

16 MR. HUDSON: Same objection.

17 **A. I don't --**

18 MR. HUDSON: Same objections. To the
19 extent that the question is inquiring about public
20 questions, you can answer; otherwise, I'm instructing
21 you not to answer unless you can avoid encroaching on
22 the attorney-client, attorney work-product or
23 legislative privileges.

24 **A. I don't recall being asked about the oath**
25 **provisions in Senate Bill 1. I do recall being asked**

1 **that assistance being provide to the voter.**

Q. How does your office interpret the mandates of this oath?

MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that it calls for attorney-client communications or attorney work-product or investigative privilege. To the extent that you can answer without encroaching on any of those privileges, you're free to do so; otherwise, I instruct you not to answer.

10 **A. I can testify as to how I would interpret the**
11 **oath. But could you repeat the last part of your**
12 **question, though?**

13 Q. How does your office interpret the mandates of
14 this oath? And to be clear, we're not looking for
15 details of any ongoing investigations, anything like
16 that, just your office's interpretation of this oath.

17 **A. Okay. Again, I can only speak to my**
18 **interpretation of the mandates of the oath, but -- do**
19 **you want to try to take them one by one or -- you know,**
20 **I would be tempted to say, you know, just exactly what's**
21 **written there. I don't -- I think it seems pretty**
22 **explanatory, but if you have a specific question about**
23 **any of those elements, I would be happy to weigh in.**

24 Q. So you would say that you understand the oath
25 to adhere strictly to the -- to the text as written

1 within the statute?

2 **A. I think so, if I understand your question**
3 **correctly, yes.**

Q. What kind of assistance is allowed under this
oath?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
Objection, form, calls for speculation. Objection to
the extent that it calls for attorney-client, attorney
work-product, or investigative privilege. To the extent
you encroach upon any privilege, I instruct you not to
answer; otherwise, you're free to do so.

**A. I would say, according to the text of the
statute, allowable assistance is reading the ballot to
the voter, directing the voter to read the ballot,
marking the voter's ballot, or directing the voter to
mark the ballot, preparing the ballot per the directions
of the voter.**

18 Q. Is there any kind of assistance that would not
19 be allowed under this oath?

20 MR. HUDSON: Same objection. Same
21 instruction.

22 **A. From my reading of the statute -- I mean, it --**
23 **what would be unlawful assistance would be marking the**
24 **ballot contrary to a voter's intentions, suggesting to**
25 **the voter how they should be voting, assisting an**

1 **A. That is my understanding.**

Q. What kind of illegal behavior would this section of the oath be aimed at preventing?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, form. Asked and answered. Objection to the extent it encroaches on attorney-client, attorney work-product or investigative privilege, I instruct you not to answer. To the extent you can answer without encroaching on those privileges, you're free to do so.

A. I would say what I said before, which is, suggesting to the voter any -- in any way how they should vote, influencing them in the voting process, or marking the ballot contrary to the voter's intentions and their independent exercise of the vote.

13
14
15 Q. I'm going to show you what is being marked as
16 Exhibit 3.

17 (Exhibit No. 3 marked.)

18 Q. 3, you can read for yourself, which I will
19 represent to you is the oath of assistants from before
20 Senate Bill 1. Again, I'll give you a moment to review.
21 Just let me know when you're finished.

22 **A. Okay.**

23 Q. Before Senate Bill 1, how was -- or withdrawn.

24 How was this oath, which is the oath
25 before Senate Bill 1, how was this oath used?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, vague.

Objection. To the extent it encroaches on attorney client or attorney work-product, investigative privilege, I instruct you not to answer. Otherwise, you're free to answer.

A. This oath would have been administered in the same way, at the polling place to an assistant for providing assistance to a voter.

Q. Based on your understanding, is there any activity that was permitted previously that is barred under the new revised oath?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.

Objection to the extent it encroaches on attorney client, attorney work-product, investigative privilege, or legislative privilege, instruct you not to answer. To the extent you can answer without encroaching on those privileges, you're free to do so.

A. Well, I would say that 64.034 never was a criminal statute, it never created an offense, but what it did is it caused the assistant at the polling place to be advised of what activity they can and cannot engage in and require them to, you know, take an oath to that effect. What was added in the, I guess, SB 1 version was behavior that, like the existing version, was already, I believe, prohibited by other parts of the

Election Code which might have been criminal provisions, and those pieces would be -- would pertain to eligibility of the voter for assistance and whether the voter had been pressured or coerced into receiving assistance, as well as communicating information about the voter's vote to another person. Those are all prohibited under other sections of the Election Code, but they were not included in the previous oath.

9 Q. And so looking at the text of the old oath,
10 starting with "I will confine my assistance to answering
11 the voter's questions, stating propositions on the
12 ballot, naming candidates." Do you believe that
13 answering questions are allowed under the revised text
14 of the oath?

15 MR. HUDSON: Objection to the extent that
16 that would call for attorney-client privilege, attorney
17 work-product, or investigative privileged information.
18 To the extent you can answer without encroaching on
19 those privileges, you're free to do so, otherwise, I
20 would instruct you not to answer.

21 **A. I think I can answer that question. Could you**
22 **repeat it, though, for me?**

23 Q. Yeah, of course. So let's see. Do you believe
24 that the revised text of the oath would prevent an
25 assister who was providing otherwise lawful assistance

1 **assistance that were, you know, guaranteed under federal**
2 **or state law were prohibited by another part of the**
3 **Election Code.**

4 Q. Would your office have concerns if it received
5 a report of an assister who was providing otherwise
6 lawful assistance, clarified the translation of ballot
7 language after receiving a question from a limited
8 English proficiency voter who didn't understand the
9 first translation?

10 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
11 Objection, form, incomplete hypothetical.

12 **A. I can only speak for myself. And if I**
13 **understand the question correctly, I would not have a**
14 **problem with a clarifying question being asked about**
15 **lawful assistance, or answered, I guess.**

Q. Do you believe that the revised oath would
allow an assister to provide that kind of clarifying
information or answer a clarifying question about a
translation?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, form. Calls for
attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product, or
investigative privilege. To the extent you can answer
that without encroaching on those, feel free to do so.

A. I would personally not interpret the law,
although I see the section that you're referring to, I

1 **see that language, I would -- I would not -- in my**
2 **practice of enforcing the code, I would not interpret**
3 **this as prohibiting that type of interaction involving**
4 **lawful assistance activities.**

5 Q. Could you -- or withdrawn.

6 Do you believe that -- but you do believe
7 that that is an interpretation that someone could make
8 reading the oath?

9 **A. I guess it's really hard for me to determine**
10 **how any reasonable or unreasonable person might**
11 **interpret the language of this oath.**

12 Q. But you could see a situation where someone who
13 reads the text, "I'll confine my assistance to reading
14 the ballot to the voter, directing the voter to read the
15 ballot, marking the voter's ballot, or directing the
16 voter to mark the ballot," could understand that
17 providing translation clarifications might fall outside
18 of the confines of permitted activity?

19 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form. Foundation.
20 Incomplete hypothetical, speculation.

21 **A. I guess I don't think that that would be the**
22 **most reasonable interpretation of this provision, but I**
23 **can see how someone could unreasonably or less**
24 **reasonably construe that one language in isolation of**
25 **the rest of the oath and take it very narrowly and come**

1 **I can't think of a situation that would kind of help me**
2 **put it into context where a word on the ballot would**
3 **need to be defined for a voter.**

4 Q. But you would only be concerned with that
5 activity insofar as it violated a different section of
6 the oath, which is to say, it indicated how a voter
7 should vote?

8 **A. Correct, yes. I can't think of another section**
9 **that it would potentially violate, that would be the one**
10 **that would come to mind as a concern.**

11 Q. Would your office have concerns if a voter with
12 a memory or cognitive impairment asked an assister who
13 had worked with them in advance to prepare to go vote
14 for a reminder as to what they had discussed previously
15 and the assister faithfully recounted that conversation?

16 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
17 Objection, incomplete hypothetical. Object to the
18 extent it would encroach on attorney-client, attorney
19 work-product, investigative privilege. To the extent
20 you can answer without encroaching on those privileges,
21 you're free to do so.

22 **A. That's a tough question. There's another**
23 **section of the code that prevents in the polling place**
24 **any communication regarding how a voter should vote, and**
25 **I have never looked at that specifically in the**

disability contest -- context. But, you know, but if I -- if I'm voting with my wife and she's in the -- the voting booth next to me, I can't tell her, "Hey, remember that race we talked about before, you know, it's -- you know, the one with the two guys with the same last name, it was this other one that" -- I can't do that, and I know I can't do that, or it's like a Class B misdemeanor or Class A misdemeanor. So I don't know. That's a good question.

Q. Do you believe that activity -- excuse me. Do you believe that activity of providing somebody with memory or cognitive impairments with a reminder or prompt of a past conversation would fall outside of the permissible activities in the revised oath?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation. Objection, incomplete hypothetical. Same objection and instruction as to attorney-client, attorney work-product, investigative privilege. To the extent you can answer without encroaching, you're free to do so. Otherwise, I'm going to instruct you not to answer.

A. I mean, it's potentially violative of the language. "I will not suggest by word, sign or gesture how the voter should vote," which has been in the oath and it's been in Section 64.036 of the code, the unlawful assistance provision, for as long as I can

1 **remember. And so that's an interesting question. I**
2 **think it would potentially violate -- you would have to**
3 **look at it and determine whether it violates a number of**
4 **sections of the code that have existed for many years.**

5 Q. So to be clear, your concerns about that kind
6 of activity would be whether it violates a separate part
7 of this oath or existing parts of the criminal code, in
8 that it is instructing a voter to vote rather than
9 providing the voter with information that they're
10 requesting?

11 **A. Correct. I think that's how I would look at it**
12 **primarily, yes.**

13 Q. To determine whether or not that was
14 permissible activity?

15 **A. Right. Whether they had suggested how the**
16 **voter should vote or influenced the vote of the voter**
17 **during the voting process.**

Q. Uh-huh. Would your office have concerns if an
assister who was providing otherwise lawful assistance
answered the voter who had visual impairments request
for confirmation that the ballot was marked as intended?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
Objection, incomplete hypothetical. Objection to the
extent it would encroach on attorney-client, attorney
work-product, or investigative privilege. To the extent

you can answer without encroaching on those privileges, you're free to do so. Otherwise, I'll instruct you not to answer.

A. I would not have any concerns about that. In fact, a portion of the oath is, "I will prepare the voter's ballot as the voter directs," so I think confirming that to the voter would not be violative of the oath or any other portion of the Election Code that I'm aware of.

10 Q. Do you consult with the Secretary of State's
11 Office in determining how to interpret these provisions
12 of the law?

13 **A. Provisions in general, or specifically the**
14 **provision that we've been talking about?**

15 Q. Let's start with provisions in general.

16 **A. If there's an area of the code that the**
17 **situation, you know, warrants it, I might discuss with**
18 **the Secretary of State's Office what their**
19 **interpretation of the code is. Under Section 31.003 of**
20 **the code, the Secretary of State is tasked with the**
21 **interpretation and the uniform application of the code,**
22 **so that is their proper role, and I would, under the**
23 **right circumstances, probably do that.**

24 Q. And what would those circumstances be?

25 **A. Just if -- if there's enough question about how**

1 a section should be interpreted, or if, for example,
2 we -- there's a provision in the code that -- I think
3 it's voting day procedures apply to early voting, if
4 possible. In other words, there are some things about
5 early voting that make it different from election day
6 where that's not possible, and so when there's a
7 conflict, that has to be resolved in an interpretive
8 way, and the Secretary of State would certainly be the
9 go to for that since they're responsible for the
10 administration of elections, or at least the
11 interpretation of how elections should be administered.
12 So we would go to them on something like that.

Q. So if you had questions about one of the kinds
of hypotheticals I mentioned, an assister answers a
voter's question --

THE REPORTER: We just lost everyone.

MR. DELLHEIM: Should we go off the record
for a second?

(Brief recess.)

MR. HUDSON: This is Eric Hudson on behalf
of the Office of Attorney General. During the break,
counsel discussed entering a stipulation on the record.
The stipulation, as I understand it, I'll allow counsel
to speak for themselves, is that my client is instructed
to avoid -- for the purposes of avoiding duplicative

objections or lengthy objections, we're stipulating on the record that my client is instructed not to provide any answers that would encroach on attorney client, attorney work-product, legislative or investigative privileges, or any other applicable privilege, including deliberative process or any others that would be -- that could conceivably be implicated by the questions.

Do you understand that instruction, Jonathan?

A. Yes.

MR. HUDSON: Okay. And I understand that all counsel are going to stipulate to that?

MS. PAIKOWSKY: Yes.

MR. HUDSON: Okay.

MS. PERALES: If I might -- am I stipulating to your instruction to the witness?

MR. HUDSON: Stipulating that the -- I'm not going to have to continue making the objection; basically that we have a running objection.

MS. PERALES: Yes. We can stipulate to that, to the extent that it applies, yes.

22 MR. HUDSON: Sure. We also understand,
23 though, by way of the stipulation, if my client has any
24 questions about whether there's any kind of privileged
25 information that he needs guidance on, we can still go

1 **A. Not for me to tell you today.**

Q. Does the way that you charge these cases change
if the voter was eligible for assistance?

MR. HUDSON: I'm going remind you of the
ongoing -- the running objection, specifically to the
parties concerning attorney work product,
attorney-client privilege, investigative privilege.

**A. I think -- yeah, I think that that would
probably involve our internal thought processes about
how we might charge a case depending on specific
factors, so I might not be able to answer that.**

Q. In the statutes is there -- are there criminal
violations that are specific to people providing -- or
withdrawn.

Is there a way in the statutes to
distinguish between unlawful assistance, meaning
assistance that is provided to voters who are not
entitled to it, and unlawful assistance that is
influencing a voter who is entitled to and seeks
assistance?

**A. It's a violation under a different subsection
of Chapter 64.036. But I don't know that we get into
that much detail on the spreadsheet. My recollection
would be that we typically, or we charged more cases,
and the lion's share of these would have been unlawful**

1 **A. Obviously the same provisions are there. I**
2 **think the same applicable provisions are there, but, I**
3 **mean, other than that, the only thing that could**
4 **potentially be applicable is the provision -- that I'm**
5 **seeing right now is the provision that you mentioned**
6 **earlier, which is confining assistance to reading the**
7 **ballot to the voter, directing the voter to read the**
8 **ballot, marking the voter's ballot or directing the**
9 **voter to mark the ballot, although I guess you could**
10 **say, literally if you take a look at that, then if they**
11 **marked the voter's ballot, even if the voter didn't**
12 **direct them to do so, that was allowable by this new**
13 **oath, so I don't know.**

Q. So is it fair to say that you think -- in your opinion, both oaths don't have specific provisions that get at this activity?

MR. HUDSON: I'll remind you of the running objection that has been stipulated to by the counsel present.

A. Yeah. I think both -- both those contain language that potentially certainly could be applicable to the activity, and under a different interpretation perhaps neither one have something that's 100 percent on point. The only thing I would add to that is that we've never prosecuted based on an oath. The oath is

informative to the assistant of allowable behavior and prohibited behavior, particularly prohibited behavior, and hopefully also instructive to the voter of what the assistant should and should not be doing.

It's the underlying offenses in the Election Code that we would look at.

7 Q. So do you believe that an assister who reads,
8 you know, the text of this oath, "I will confine my
9 assistance to reading the ballot to the voter, directing
10 the voter to read the ballot, marking the voter's
11 ballot, and directing the voter to mark the ballot,"
12 would govern the assister's behavior?

13 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
14 Objection, form, incomplete hypothetical.

15 **A. Only in the most practical sense, because a**
16 **person's understanding is going to govern their**
17 **behavior. Again, I'm, you know, answering a**
18 **hypothetical. I think in an objective sense, obviously**
19 **the law says what it says.**

20 Q. Could a voter who reads this assistance -- or,
21 sorry, an assister who reads this oath understand it to
22 sort of strictly govern their permissible behaviors?

23 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
24 Objection, form, speculation. Objection, form,
25 incomplete hypothetical.

1 **situations where voters were -- voters may have been**
2 **approached and pressured into receiving assistance**
3 **outside of a polling place or even with regards to mail**
4 **ballots, and we did not have an adequate statute to**
5 **address that interaction at that time. However, I do**
6 **believe there was a -- possibly an amendment made to**
7 **Chapter 64.036 that helped in that area, possibly with**
8 **SB 5 in the special session of the 85th Legislature that**
9 **helped in that regard, so these may have been older**
10 **cases.**

11 Q. So was that in 2017?

12 A. Uh-huh. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And of all of the cases that you have pointed
out to me today, which of these, if any, to your
knowledge took place in person at a polling place?

A. The case that certainly didn't involve mail
ballots, and it was the violation of Chapter 61.008,
would have happened at a polling place for sure, and
I -- I don't recall specifically any others. I'm not
saying there weren't any, but I don't recall
specifically any others that happened at a polling place
that I can tell just based on these notes and without
refreshing my recollection.

Q. Sorry. One moment.

MS. PERALES: And just so I'm not lost,

you're talking about Patricia Barton in Medina County on
Page 7?

THE WITNESS: That's the one that jumps
out to memory, yes, ma'am.

Q. (By Ms. Paikowsky) So based on your knowledge
today, other than that one case, none of those cases
listed in the exhibit took place in person at a polling
place?

**A. I'm not recalling any from my memory, so I
would agree to that, to avoid having to look through
each one of them again, but that's my recollection.**

Q. And the Patricia Barton case, that one you
noted did not involve assistance?

A. I don't believe it did involve assistance, no.

15 Q. And all of the cases that we discussed involved
16 violations of existing statutes that predated SB 1?

17 **A. Correct, which are still in place today.**

18 Q. They're still in place today. Thank you.

19 Just one minute. Okay. So I'm going to
20 move on to the mail -- the mail ballot identification
21 provisions of Senate Bill 1. So first of all, do you
22 believe that all eligible voters who want to participate
23 in an election should be able to cast a ballot and have
24 their ballot counted?

25 **A. Yes.**

1 Q. So I'm going to show you a document that we're
2 going to mark as Exhibit -- that we're going to mark as
3 Exhibit -- what are we on? 4?

4 MR. HUDSON: Yes.

5 (Exhibit No. 4 marked.)

6 Q. Can you look at Section A3 or, sorry, A4, and
7 tell me what that -- what that provision means?

8 MR. HUDSON: I'll just remind you of the
9 running objection concerning privileges.

A. So this is a -- it says it's a new provision.

**A person commits an offense if a person knowingly or
intentionally makes any effort to prevent a voter from
casting a legal ballot in an election in which the voter
is eligible to vote.**

**I'm not sure how to interpret that, aside
from its statutory language, but I would be happy to
answer any specific questions you have about it.**

Q. Do you believe that this law furthers the
interest of election integrity?

MR. HUDSON: Same objections, including
the running objections.

A. I -- I imagine that is the intent.

23 Q. In what way do you think this law would further
24 the interests of election integrity?

25 **A. I think it's designed -- it seems designed to**

1 **information to continue the process. That's not to say**
2 **that a harvesting crew that's well connected with a good**
3 **database couldn't obtain some of those numbers, but it**
4 **would be more difficult and it would be above the**
5 **sophistication level of a lot of harvesting crews that**
6 **we've dealt with.**

7 Q. Okay. And so we talked about vote harvesting.
8 Are there different types of vote harvesting crimes?

9 **A. There are a handful of specific offenses in the**
10 **Election Code that are invoked kind of in the vote**
11 **harvesting activity.**

12 Q. And is vote harvesting illegal at all stages of
13 the voting process?

14 **A. It really kind of depends on how you define**
15 **vote harvesting.**

Q. Would you mind clarifying for me the different
types of vote harvesting crimes that could be deterred
by the -- by SB1's new mail ballot ID requirement?

MR. HUDSON: Remind you of the running
objections.

A. Starting at the beginning with vote harvesting,
you have a seeding phase or an application phase that
focuses on applications for mail ballots, and fraudulent
submission of mail ballots on behalf of a voter could be
hampered by the requirement to include a piece of

identifying information, or an identifier such as a DL or the last four of the social. That could be an obstacle to a vote harvesting crew that wishes to bypass the voter.

And then, as I already stated, it could also be an obstacle to gaining the voter's compliance, because here's a stranger asking for my DL number so that they can complete these documents on my behalf or submit this, you know, carrier envelope on my behalf, so it -- by putting the control of the interaction more in the voter's hands because those are -- those are numbers that the voter has access to that the harvester is less likely to have access to, I think it promotes security in that fashion.

15 Q. So if I, moving forward, refer to the activity
16 you described of collecting as many absentee ballots and
17 collecting and submitting ballots by mail as illegal
18 vote harvesting, will you understand what I'm referring
19 to?

20 **A. Sure. And if for some reason that definition**
21 **needs clarifying, then I'll bring it up at that time.**

22 Q. You mentioned that SB1's mail ballot
23 identification requirements would be more effective in
24 preventing some vote harvesting more so than others.
25 Are there instances you can think of where SB1's mail

1 or have the voter fill out their own identification
2 number?

3 **A. That's right. Absolutely.**

4 MS. PAIKOWSKY: If it's okay, can I take a
5 five-minute break?

6 **A. Sure.**

7 MR. HUDSON: No objection.

8 (Lunch recess.)

9 Q. (By Ms. Paikowsky) Mr. White, I'm going to go
back to asking questions about SB1's mail ballot
identification provisions. Without SB1's mail ballot
identification provisions, would your office have other
means of detecting vote harvesting?

MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that
that would encroach on investigator privilege, and
remind you of the stipulation concerning the running
objection. Just instruct the witness, to the extent
that that would encroach on methods of investigation or
practices, I'll instruct you not to answer.

**A. Yeah. Without going into our mental
impressions and our investigative practices, I guess I
could say we have prosecuted vote harvesting cases in
the past.**

24 Q. And this, again, is not seeking specific
25 information about any investigation, but do you have --

1 interpreting the statute?

2 HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.

3 Calls for speculation. Incomplete hypothetical.

4 **A. Yeah, I don't know if I could -- if I could**
5 **answer how a county might or might not interpret or**
6 **enforce the statute.**

7 Q. Do you think counties might vary in their
8 interpretation of Paragraph G, refusal to accept a
9 watcher?

10 MR. HUDSON: Same objections.

11 **A. I don't know.**

12 Q. You do deal with local prosecutors in your
13 current work; is that correct?

14 **A. Yes, ma'am.**

15 Q. Has it ever been your experience that local
16 prosecutors have varied interpretations of the same
17 language within the Texas Election Code?

18 **A. I have experienced that before.**

Q. Have you ever advised a local prosecutor that
something the prosecutor thought was unlawful was not
unlawful in your view?

A. I don't --

MR. HUDSON: I would remind you of the
running objection that the parties have stipulated to.
Otherwise, you're free to answer.

1 **A. Yeah. I probably couldn't go into those types**
2 **of communications, but I don't recall specific**
3 **situations.**

4 Q. Do you have an attorney-client relationship
5 with local prosecutors?

6 **A. If they approach me in an advisory capacity,**
7 **depending on the situation, I could, but I don't have**
8 **a -- like a freestanding relationship.**

9 Q. Let me ask the question slightly differently.
10 Have you ever stepped in to prosecute an election
11 offense when the local county prosecutor declined to do
12 so?

13 **A. I don't have a specific recollection of any**
14 **time that we have prosecuted a offense where we have had**
15 **a conversation with a District Attorney who has taken**
16 **that position.**

17 Q. Now, prior to December --

18 **A. Uh-huh.**

19 Q. -- it was true, then, that sometimes your
20 office would secure an indictment of a defendant for
21 election fraud without working in cooperation with the
22 local prosecutor; is that right?

23 **A. Without working directly with that office,**
24 **that's correct, we could do that.**

25 Q. And so I believe you had testified previously

1 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.

2 Objection, calls for speculation.

3 **A. I don't know what that -- that action would be.**
4 **Could be anything, I suppose.**

5 Q. Okay. Do you know what action would be to
6 distance the watcher from the activity or procedure?

7 MR. HUDSON: Same objections.

8 **A. I don't. I don't have a list of examples of**
9 **that off the top of my head, no, ma'am.**

10 Q. Do you know what would -- do you know what
11 would constitute a manner that would make observation
12 not reasonably effective?

13 MR. HUDSON: Same objections.

14 **A. No. We would -- we would take a set of facts**
15 **that we were given in a complaint and then we would try**
16 **to apply the law, and I don't typically work in reverse.**

17 Q. Have you developed any standards at this point
18 for deciding what would be an action that would obstruct
19 the view of a watcher?

20 **A. No, ma'am.**

Q. Have you developed any standards that would
allow you to decide whether a poll official had
distanced the watcher from the activity?

MR. HUDSON: I'll just remind you of the
running objection that we have concerning privileges,

and also note the deliberative process privilege is one of those.

3 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear
4 you.

MR. HUDSON: Deliberative process privilege is also one of those. Instruct you not to answer to the extent you would be encroaching on any privileges.

A. I'll follow that advice.

10 Q. Do you have a distance -- let's just talk about
11 the voting machine. Do you vote here in Travis County?

12 **A. No, ma'am.**

13 Q. Tell me about the -- tell me about the voting
14 apparatus in the county where you do vote.

15 **A. Just a typical hard voting system, prints a**
16 **paper ballot and you scan it in at the door on your way**
17 **out.**

18 Q. So it's a DRE. You use a touchscreen; is that
19 right?

20 **A. You use a -- I can't remember if it's a**
21 **touchscreen or if it's --**

22 Q. It's a wheel?

23 **A. I can't remember if it's still a wheel, but**
24 **you -- it will print the ballot for you after you've**
25 **entered it electronically. And then you turn it in or**

1 **scan it at the door on your way out.**

2 Q. Okay. So generally you vote on a machine that
3 has a screen and it's sitting on a little table with
4 some long legs on it; is that right?

5 **A. Yes, ma'am.**

6 Q. Okay. And then you're going to take the piece
7 of paper that it gives you, and you're going to walk
8 over to that receptacle and put your piece of paper in
9 there; is that right?

10 **A. Yes, ma'am. Place it in the receptacle.**

11 Q. Okay. Sometimes called a tabulator. Okay. So
12 let's take the instance of a voter who is standing at
13 one of those voting machines like the kind that you vote
14 on, Mr. White. How close -- let me ask the question
15 this way. How far could a watcher be placed by the
16 election judge such that it would violate Section
17 4.09(a) in SB 1?

18 MR. HUDSON: Objection. Incomplete
19 hypothetical. Objection, calls for speculation.

20 **A. I don't think I could answer that.**

21 Q. Is it because you don't know?

22 **A. I couldn't --**

23 MR. HUDSON: Objection, calls for an
24 incomplete hypothetical. Calls for speculation.

25 **A. Yeah. I don't have enough facts to -- to**

answer that question. And even if I did have enough facts, it would probably involve me going into my thought processes about -- about the offense, and so I don't think I could answer that.

Q. Okay. At this point, I would like to say on the record that you should listen to your counsel, and especially if he instructs you not to answer the question. But counsel is limited to making form objections and not speaking objections. And so in order to avoid any appearance of coaching the witness, which I know counsel would never do, his form objections --

MR. HUDSON: Well, I'll just go ahead and stop you right there and say you're tossing out coaching on the record. Nobody is coaching by giving form and giving the description of what the objection is, which I've been limiting to one word. We also have a standing objection, our standing or running objection based on privileges. And I would point out that some of your questions are clearly targeted at getting at privileged information, so I'm simply reminding the witness of the stipulation that you made early on so that I wouldn't give long objections based on privilege.

If you want me to go ahead and start making all formal objections because you're concerned that I'm giving speaking objections, I'm happy to do

that. I'm just trying to make sure that my client isn't reaching out and expanding beyond the privilege stipulation that we've already made.

MS. PERALES: You have your running stipulation, and we've agreed to that. I just want to make sure that the form objections are stated as succinctly as the rules hope we do.

Q. (By Ms. Perales) So let's go back to the voting machine scenario. Mr. White, you're familiar with your own voting machine that you use in the polling place in your home county. If we have a situation where there's a watcher and a voter, and an election judge, and the election judge has distanced the watcher from that machine and the activity of the voter at that machine, is it your testimony that -- that that is still not enough information upon which you could make a decision whether there is a violation of 4.09 of SB 1?

MR. HUDSON: Objection, speculation.
Incomplete hypothetical.

A. I think that's correct, that I wouldn't have enough information.

22 Q. Could you explain to me how this new language
23 in 4.09(a) makes unlawful behavior that previously would
24 have been lawful?

25 **A. I would say the plain text that was added adds**

1 Q. Understood. In your experience, does vote
2 harvesting occur in the context of paid campaign workers
3 or otherwise compensated individuals working on behalf
4 of a campaign?

5 **A. Generally, yes.**

6 Q. Have you ever encountered an instance of
7 improper voter assistance carried out by an individual
8 who is not working for a political campaign?

9 **A. If so, it would be quite rare.**

Q. Have you ever encountered that instance?

**A. Example -- an example or examples that come to
mind would be subject to privilege for an ongoing
investigation or prosecution, so I wouldn't want to talk
specifically about them, but --**

MR. HUDSON: I'll make a formal objection
based on that, to the extent it would encroach on
attorney-client, work-product, investigative privilege,
or any other stipulated objection, I would instruct you
not to answer. But to the extent that you can go ahead
and respond, please do so.

**A. I think -- I think the answer would be
possibly, yes, without getting into any detail.**

23 Q. Okay. So let me ask a question that might not
24 encroach on privilege. Have you ever yourself or your
25 office brought charges against an individual for

1 unlawful voter assistance when that individual was not
2 working for a political campaign?

3 **A. And by "unlawful assistance," you mean a**
4 **violation of 64.036.**

5 Q. Or the other measures that we have discussed
6 before, 64.012, 276.013.

7 **A. I'm not sure. I'm not sure on those specific**
8 **statutes. But what I could tell you is that almost all**
9 **of the cases that we see that involve assistance fraud**
10 **involve individuals that we believed were associated**
11 **with campaigns or working directly for a candidate or a**
12 **slate of candidates, or were relatives of candidates or**
13 **the candidates themselves.**

Q. Thank you. And so sitting here today, you cannot recall an instance in which your office has brought charges against an individual for violating either 64.036 or 64.012, or 276.013, when that defendant was not working for a candidate or campaign or slate of candidates, correct?

A. Or a relative of the candidate or the candidate
themselves?

Q. Right.

A. If you include those -- if you can give me one
moment. I can --

MR. HUDSON: For purposes of the record, I

would point out that you were referencing -- would you identify that by exhibit number?

THE WITNESS: That's Exhibit 6, which is the list of our pending -- includes a list of our pending prosecutions.

A. I can think of -- I could think of one --

Q. Where you brought charges?

A. -- case where charges have been brought. There could be more, but I don't have a recollection of them at this time.

Q. Tell me about that one case.

A. I can't go into that case due to --

Q. If charges have been brought, wouldn't that be a public record?

A. There's a pending prosecution.

Q. I see. Are there charging documents?

A. There are.

Q. Have they been filed?

A. They have.

Q. Where have they been filed?

A. In the district court where the case is charged.

Q. What is that district court? If it's a public record, I'm entitled to know about it.

MR. HUDSON: If I could have just a minute

to advise him on what he can and can't talk about. If we can go off the record just a moment.

(Brief recess.)

MR. HUDSON: Mr. White, so I understand, the case that you're referring to is on Exhibit --

THE WITNESS: 6.

MR. HUDSON: Exhibit 6. I'm instructing you -- to the extent that there's anything in the public record about the case, I'm instructing you to testify about that. To the extent that there are details that are part of ongoing investigative processes, attorney-client privilege, attorney work product, or any other applicable privileges, I'm instructing you not to answer. But to the extent it's on the public record, I'm instructing you to answer.

A. The case --

MR. HUDSON: Let her ask her question.

A. Go ahead.

Q. (By Ms. Perales) I think we were out there, the question was half answered. But I'll go ahead and make a new question for you.

MR. HUDSON: Sorry about that.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

Q. Please describe for me the charges that you mentioned a few minutes ago related to a particular

defendant and the scenario that I was describing.

A. Okay. The case that came to mind does not actually involve ballot assistance, it involved voter registration, and so it may not be directly applicable to your -- your question, and I think it may not. It -- what sparked my memory is that it did involve an offense under 276.013, but it was not under the influencing the voter subsection, so I don't think that it would be responsive, but I have been instructed that, if it were responsive, I would disclose to you --

MR. HUDSON: Well, don't tell her what I instructed you.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

MR. HUDSON: That's on the record.

A. But if something is in the public record, I would make that available to you.

17 Q. Yes. So is there a reference to that on the
18 Exhibit 6 somewhere?

19 **A. The case is one of our pending -- one of our**
20 **pending prosecutions.**

21 Q. And since charges have been filed, can you
22 point to me which page that pending prosecution is on in
23 the exhibit?

24 **A. It's -- well, it's -- again, it's not**
25 **responsive to the -- to the subject area that we were**

1 Q. Thank you. Do you know who Omar Escobar is
2 from Starr County?

3 **A. I do.**

4 Q. Would you consider him a friend?

5 **A. Consider him a former colleague.**

6 Q. Because he's not the DA anymore, correct?

7 **A. Correct.**

8 Q. Do you -- do you receive complaints about
9 public officials coercing votes from their employees
unlawfully?

A. We would receive those.

MR. HUDSON: I'll just remind you of the
running stipulation. You can answer generally, but to
the extent it encroaches on privileges, please bear that
in mind.

16 Q. (By Ms. Perales) Have you ever prosecuted a
17 public official for coercing votes from public
18 employees?

19 **A. Not that I can recall.**

20 Q. Are you aware of any public information
21 suggesting that Omar Escobar has coerced public
22 employees unlawfully with respect to their political
23 support or their votes?

24 **A. I'm not aware of any -- I'm not aware of any**
25 **public information to that effect.**

1 Mr. White, my name is Laura Rosenbaum. I
2 am one of the attorneys for the Mi Familia Vota
3 plaintiffs in this case. So nice to meet you. And I
4 know it's late in the afternoon. I won't take too much
5 of your time. And hopefully I won't be repeating
6 questions that have already been asked today. There
7 have been a little bit of issues with the Zoom
8 connection, but I just have a couple of topics that I
9 don't, don't think have been fully addressed. Can you
10 hear me okay?

11 **A. Yes, ma'am.**

12 Q. Okay. Thank you. Have you or has your office
13 been involved in any prosecutions for fraud that relate
14 to drive-through voting?

15 **A. No, ma'am.**

Q. Are you aware of any investigations into
allegations of fraud that relate to drive-through
voting?

MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that it
would call for attorney-client, attorney work-product or
investigative privilege. If you can answer without
encroaching on those, you're free to do so. Otherwise,
I'm instructing you not to answer.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, you'll have to
slow down. Work product or investigative privilege?

MR. HUDSON: To the extent you can answer without encroaching on any of those privileges, you're free to do so.

A. I'm not able to discuss any investigations that -- that are not public.

6 Q. Are you aware of any complaints of voter fraud
7 that relate to drive-through voting?

8 MR. HUDSON: Same objection. Same
9 instruction.

10 **A. Same answer to the extent that those would have**
11 **sparked an investigation.**

12 Q. So you don't have access to complaints that
13 you've received, that your office has received that
14 relate to drive-through voting? Because if they were
15 received from the public -- from members of the public,
16 they would not be attorney-client privileged.

17 MR. HUDSON: Objection, argumentative.
18 Objection, same instruction. Same objections with
19 regard to privilege.

20 Q. (By Ms. Rosenbaum) The question is, has your
21 office received any complaints from the public that
22 relate to allegations of fraud that involve
23 drive-through voting?

24 MR. HUDSON: Same objection. Same
25 instructions.

1
2
3
4
5
6 I, JONATHAN S. WHITE, have read the
7 foregoing deposition and hereby affix my signature that
8 same is true and correct, except as noted above.
9

10 JONATHAN S. WHITE
11 STATE OF TEXAS)
12 COUNTY OF TRAVIS)

13 Before me, _____, on this
14 the day personally appeared JONATHAN S. WHITE known to
15 me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the
16 foregoing instrument and acknowledge to me that they
17 executed the same for the purposes and consideration
18 therein expressed.

19 Given under my hand and seal of office
20 this ____ day of _____, 2022.
21
22

23 NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR
24 THE STATE OF _____
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

LA UNION DEL PUEBLO §
ENTERO, ET AL., §
Plaintiffs, § Civil Action No.
§ 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
VS. § (Consolidated Cases)

STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL. §
Defendants. §

ORAL DEPOSITION OF
JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE
APRIL 27, 2022

I, CAROLINE CHAPMAN, Certified Shorthand
Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify
to the following:

That the witness, JONATHAN S. WHITE was duly
sworn by the officer and that the transcript of the oral
deposition is a true record of the testimony given by
the witness;

That the deposition transcript was
submitted on May ____, 2022 to the witness or to the
attorney for the witness for examination, signature, and
return to me within 20 days;

That the amount of time used by each party
at the deposition is as follows:

Honorable Dana Paikowsky - Three hours and

1 seventeen minutes.

2 Honorable Nina Perales - Three hours and
3 fifty-six minutes.

4 Honorable Laura E. Rosenbaum - Six
5 minutes.

6 That pursuant to information given to the
7 deposition officer at the time said testimony was taken,
8 the appearance pages include all parties of record.

9 I further certify that I am neither
10 counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
11 parties or attorneys in the action in which this
12 proceeding was taken, and further that I am not
13 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of
14 the action.

15 Certified to by me on May 2, 2022.

16
17 CAROLINE CHAPMAN, Texas CSR 467
18 Expiration Date: 03/31/2023
19 Firm Registration No. 223
20 WORLDWIDE COURT REPORTERS
21 3000 Weslayan, Suite 235
22 Houston, Texas 77027
23 (713) 572-2000
24
25